Case 2:20-cv-01157-TLN-DMC Document 18 Filed 03/10/21 Page 1 of 2

	1	RORY C. QUINTANA (SBN: 258747)		
	2	rory@qhplaw.com QUINTANA HANAFI, LLP		
	3	870 Market St., Ste. 819 San Francisco, CA 94102		
	4	Telephone: (415) 504-3121 Fax: (415) 233-8770		
	5	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
	6	HEIDI FARRARA		
Gordon Kees Scully Mansukhani, LLP 3 Park Center Drive, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95825	7	TALIA L. DELANOY (SBN: 239973) tdelanoy@grsm.com		
	8	ANNETTE L. ROSE (SBN: 311274) arose@grsm.com	_	
	9	GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LL 3 Park Center Drive, Ste. 200	LP	
	10	Sacramento, CA 95825 Telephone: (916) 830-6531		
	11	Facsimile: (916) 920-4402		
	12	Attorneys for Defendant DAY MANAGEMENT CORPORATION dba DAY WIRELESS SYSTEMS		
	13			
	14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	15	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	16			
	17	HEIDI FARRARA, an individual,) CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01157-TLN-) DMC	
3	18	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING JOINT	
	19	VS.	REQUEST TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER	
	20	DAY WIRELESS SYSTEMS an Oregon corporation, inclusive,	Complaint filed June 9, 2020	
	21	Defendants.) Complaint fried Julie 9, 2020	
	22	Defendants.	<u></u>	
	23	On March 9, 2021, the Parties filed a Joint Request to Modify the Scheduling		
	24	Order (Document 15) requesting modification of	the initial Scheduling Order (Document	
	25	3) issued on June 9, 2020, by U.S. District Court	Judge Troy L. Nunley. The Parties	
	26	presented the following good cause in support of	their request to modify the scheduling	
	27	order:		
	28	-1-		
	I	1		

Order Granting Joint Request to Modify Scheduling Order (FRCP Rule 16) 2:20-cv-01157-TLN-DMC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 1. On or about June 9, 2020, the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order became order of the Court by Judge Troy Nunley [Dkt. 3].
- 2. On or about October 1, 2020, the Court issued a Minute Order advising the Parties to submit any request to modify the Court's Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order through a Joint Stipulation with specific deadlines [Dkt. 12].
- 3. After Judge Nunley issued the scheduling order, the Parties moved forward with written and oral discovery. However, the Parties' ability to complete necessary discovery has been hampered and delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular, there has been significant delay in receiving records from third-party medical care providers.
- 4. While the Parties have been diligent in pursuing discovery, they will be unable to complete discovery by the present deadlines as ordered in the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order.

5. The parties proposed the following schedule:

Matter	Current Date	Continued Date
Non-Expert Discovery	April 5, 2021	July 6, 2021
Cutoff Expert Witness Disclosure	June 4, 2021	September 2, 2021
Rebuttal Expert Witness	July 6, 2021	November 3, 2021
Disclosure Supplemental Disclosures and responses (including expert supplemental	September 4, 2021	December 3, 2021
materials)		
Dispositive Motion Deadline	October 4, 2021	February 3, 2022

6. The Parties agreed that additional time is needed to complete discovery and expert discovery and that the requested continue is in the best interest of all Parties, and will not unduly prejudice any Party.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Troy L. Nunley Dated: March 10, 2021 United States District Judge